SOME NAMES WHICH MUST BE DISCARDED.

BY WM. H. DALL.

In January, 1853, Gray (Brit. Mus. Cat. Brach., p. 114) instituted the genus Cistella for Terebratula caneata of Risso and allied forms. This name has been generally adopted and, in the last revision of the Brachiopods by Schuchert, is not credited with any synonyms. But in 1848, Gistel, in his Naturgeschichte des Thierreichs, p. xi, proposed the name Cistella for a group of Insects. For the Brachiopod, therefore, I propose the name Argyrotheca, with the same type.

The name Euryta was proposed for a subgenus of Terebra, by H. and A. Adams in 1858, and is in general use, but Euryta had already been used for an acaleph by Gistel, in 1848, and must therefore be rejected. In its place I would propose Mazatlania. In 1876 Jeffreys proposed Glomus for a remarkable bivalve allied to Leda, but he had also been preceded by Gistel, who had proposed the name Glomus for a beetle (Naturg. p. xi, 1848). The genus may take the name of Pristigloma.

The dismemberment of the heterogeneous Linnean genus Patella was one of the first tasks of naturalists after the publication of the Systema Naturæ. The first author to undertake this necessary work has been generally overlooked. This was Modeer, who in 1793 (K. vetensk. Akad. nya Handl. xiv, pp. 110-111) divided the true limpets from those with internal septa or processes and gave to the latter group, with a proper diagnosis, the name of Cheilea. This group was subsequently divided by authors who, however, omitted to reserve any portion of the original genus Cheilea to preserve the name, as required by the rules of nomenclature. On the five species cited as examples by Modeer, four genera were instituted by Humphrey (after Hwass) in 1797, two belonging to his genus Crypta, more generally known as Crepidula. In 1799 Lamarck made two subdivisions with new names for three of the species, and added a third in 1809. Ferussac added a synonym to one of Humphrey's names in 1807, and Schumacher did the same in 1817, while a subgeneric name was proposed by Mörch, for one of the two Crepidulas, in 1852. What name must we now reject, to reinstate

Cheilea in its rights? There was no diagnosis given with Humphrey's names, only lists of species. Passing them over, we find Lamarck eliminated Crepidula and Calyptræa with proper diagnoses, though his Calyptræa comprised species of two genera. He left behind a single species, which, if Lamarck had been the first to divide the genus, would have kept the name Cheilea. On the other hand, he included in his genus Calyptræa, a species he should have omitted. The first was named Septaria by Ferussac in 1807, and this left only one genus included in the original Cheilea unnamed. This was called Mitrularia by Schumacher in 1817, but in our opinion this name must be rejected for that of Modeer, which should be adopted for the group represented by the Patella equestris of Linnaeus.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

MOLLUSCA OF THE GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS. By Henry A. Pilsbry. Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci., Phila., 1900, pp. 110-150. This is the most interesting faunal list the writer has seen in a long while. It results from the explorations of Messrs. Pilsbry, Ferriss, Bryant Walker, Clapp and Sargent in July and August, 1899, along the Tennessee-North Carolina boundary, among the valleys and on the peaks of the Great Smoky Mountains. In all, fifty-six species of terrestrial mollusca were obtained, among which Gastrodonta walkeri, Punctum blandianum, and several varieties of different species are described as new. Two things are especially noticeable, one the abundance of endemic species and varieties, the other the absence of many species which one is accustomed to regard as universally distributed in the mountains of this continent. Of course more of the latter may yet be found, but it cannot be purely accidental that the party came upon no Vitrina, no Pupa, only one Vertigo, and that very rare, only one Bifidaria, also rare, and no Vallonia! In some cases widely-distributed species are represented by segregates which have attained specific rank; thus in place of Vitrea indentata there is an abundance of V. carolinensis of a small type (var. wetherbyi, Ckll. ined.) intermediate between indentata and carolinensis proper, the exact locality of which is unfortunately unknown. In the case